

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ANTHONY BAILEY, et al.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CLARK COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01954-JCM-CWH

ORDER

Plaintiff Anthony Bailey has submitted a motion requiring the court to restore defendants Clark County and Clark County Detention Center (#18). The court denies this motion.

As a threshold matter, the motion is not signed by all plaintiffs. Plaintiff Bailey cannot represent the other plaintiffs. Russell v. United States, 308 F.2d 78, 79 (9th Cir. 1962). For that reason alone, the court would deny the motion.


The court dismissed the Clark County Detention Center because it is a building, not an entity that is capable of suing or being sued. The mission statement that plaintiff Bailey attached to the motion does not create an entity that is capable of suing or being sued.

The court dismissed Clark County because plaintiffs had not alleged any involvement by the county at all. Plaintiff Bailey now claims that Clark County failed to train the “Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department/CCDC,” which plaintiff Bailey styles as a subordinate to Clark County. These allegations appear nowhere in the complaint. Furthermore, plaintiffs did not name the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department as a defendant in this action. Plaintiff Bailey cannot

1 now attempt to conflate the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department with the Clark County
2 Detention Center to try to make the police department a defendant.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff Bailey's motion requiring the court to restore
4 defendants Clark County and Clark County Detention Center (#18) is **DENIED**.

5 DATED: May 14, 2013.

6
7 
8 JAMES C. MAHAN
United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28